

ON THE DIRICHLET PROBLEM FOR HARMONIC MAPS WITH PRESCRIBED SINGULARITIES

GILBERT WEINSTEIN

February 7, 2008

ABSTRACT. Let (M, g) be a classical Riemannian globally symmetric space of rank one and non-compact type. We prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the Dirichlet problem for harmonic maps into (M, g) with prescribed singularities along a closed submanifold of the domain. This generalizes our previous work where such maps into the hyperbolic plane were constructed. This problem, in the case where (M, g) is the complex-hyperbolic plane, has applications to equilibrium configurations of co-axially rotating charged black holes in General Relativity.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Einstein vacuum equations in the stationary axially symmetric case reduce to a harmonic map from $\mathbb{R}^3$ into $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{R}}^2$, the hyperbolic plane, with prescribed singularities along the axis of symmetry. In [18, 19], we used this fact to construct solutions of these equations which could be interpreted as a pair of rotating black holes held apart by a singular strut. These solutions generalized the static Weyl solutions, see [1]. The first step in this program was to solve a Dirichlet problem for such maps with the singularity prescribed along a closed submanifold of the domain. A natural generalization of this problem is to replace the Einstein vacuum equations with the Einstein-Maxwell equations. A similar reduction again leads to a harmonic map problem with prescribed singularities, but the target is now $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$, the complex hyperbolic plane, see [11].

In this paper, we study the Dirichlet problem for harmonic maps with prescribed singularities from a smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, into (M, g) a classical Riemannian globally symmetric space of rank one and of non-compact type. Thus (M, g) is either the real-, complex-, or quaternion-hyperbolic space, i.e. $(M, g) = \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\ell}$, where $\ell \geq 2$, and $\mathbb{K}$ is either $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$, or the quaternions $\mathbb{H}$, see [6]. For simplicity,

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 58E20, Secondary 83C57.

Key words and phrases. Harmonic maps, singularities, Riemannian globally symmetric spaces, rotating black holes.

Research supported in part by a grant from NSF EPSCoR in Alabama

we take the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{R}^n$, although all the results carry over easily to bounded domains in Riemannian manifolds. Recall that a map $\varphi: \Omega \rightarrow (M, g)$ is *harmonic* if for each $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$ the map $\varphi|_{\Omega'}$ is a critical point of the energy:

$$(1) \quad E_{\Omega'}(\varphi) = \int_{\Omega'} |d\varphi|^2,$$

where $|d\varphi|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n g(\nabla_k \varphi, \nabla_k \varphi)$. It then satisfies an elliptic system of nonlinear partial differential equations, written in local coordinates on M as:

$$\Delta \varphi^a + \sum_{k=1}^n \Gamma_{bc}^a \partial_k \varphi^b \partial_k \varphi^c = 0,$$

where Γ_{bc}^a are the Christoffel symbols of (M, g) . Harmonic maps have been studied extensively. The Dirichlet problem for harmonic maps into a manifold of non-positive curvature was first solved by R. Hamilton in [4] using a heat flow method. A variational approach was later developed by R. Schoen and K. Uhlenbeck, see [13, 14]. More recently, P. Li and L.-F. Tam constructed harmonic maps between hyperbolic spaces, see [7, 8].

It is well known that if (M, g) has negative sectional curvature and $\varphi: \Omega \rightarrow (M, g)$ is a finite energy harmonic map then $\varphi \in C^\infty(\Omega; M)$. Furthermore, if $\partial\Omega$ is of class $C^{2,\alpha}$, and $\varphi|_{\partial\Omega}$ is $C^{2,\alpha}$, then $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}; M)$, see [14].

Let Σ_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, be disjoint closed smooth submanifolds of Ω of co-dimension at least 2, and set $\Sigma = \cup_{i=1}^N \Sigma_i$. For each $1 \leq i \leq N$, let $\gamma_i: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (M, g)$ be a unit speed geodesic, and let $\varphi_i: \Omega \setminus \Sigma_i \rightarrow (M, g)$ be a harmonic map singular on Σ_i whose image is contained in $\gamma_i(\mathbb{R})$ and such that $\varphi(x) \rightarrow \gamma_i(+\infty) \in \partial M$ as $x \rightarrow \Sigma_i$. We shall call such a map a Σ_i -singular map into γ_i , provided it satisfies an additional technical condition. Since γ_i is (trivially) flat and totally geodesic, such a map is easily constructed from a harmonic function u_i on $\Omega \setminus \Sigma_i$ which tends to infinity on Σ_i . Let $\psi: \partial\Omega \rightarrow M$ be a smooth boundary map. We wish to find a harmonic map $\varphi: \Omega \setminus \Sigma \rightarrow (M, g)$ which has boundary values ψ , and is asymptotic to φ_i near Σ_i , see section 2 for the definitions. The main result of this paper is the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *For $1 \leq i \leq N$, let φ_i be a Σ_i -singular map into γ_i , and let $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\partial\Omega; M)$. Then, there exists a unique harmonic map $\varphi \in C^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma; M) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Sigma; M)$, such that $\varphi = \psi$ on $\partial\Omega$, and φ is asymptotic to φ_i near Σ_i for each $1 \leq i \leq N$.*

On the one hand, these maps may be viewed as non-linear generalizations of harmonic functions u which tend to $\pm\infty$ on Σ , the case $m = 1$. Note that in this case there are only two points at infinity in (M, g) . On the other hand, they may be viewed as generalizations of geodesic rays, the case $n = 1$. However, in this case Σ is necessarily empty, and thus singular asymptotic behavior can only be prescribed at infinity. Also, we should point out that M. Anderson constructed in [2] complete area-minimizing hypersurfaces in hyperbolic spaces asymptotic to a

given set at infinity. However, he assumes the given set cuts the boundary of (M, g) into exactly two connected components, a situation entirely different from ours.

We use a direct variational method to prove Theorem 1, following the same outline as in [18, 19]. The difficulty is that the prescribed singularities force all admissible maps to have infinite energy on Ω . To remedy this, we renormalize the energy, making use of the Busemann functions on (M, g) . Busemann functions were used in [16] to prove a Liouville type theorem for harmonic maps into negatively curved manifolds. Our method would apply to construct harmonic maps with prescribed singularities into any simply connected manifold of pinched negative curvature were it not for the fact that we use the specific structure of (M, g) in a crucial way in Lemma 6. In another direction, one could try to relax the curvature condition to allow for symmetric spaces of rank ≥ 2 as targets.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we discuss some preliminaries. This includes a detailed study of manifolds with pinched negative curvature necessary for the variational approach to go through. Also included in this section are some definitions, and a maximum principle needed for the uniqueness. In Section 3, we present the proof of Theorem 1 in the somewhat simpler case $N = 1$ where only one singular asymptotic behavior is prescribed for φ . Nevertheless, the proof of this case already contains most of the main ideas. Then, in Section 4, we treat the case $N \geq 2$, where multiple behaviors are prescribed. In an appendix, we provide some of the calculations needed in the proof of Lemma 6.

In a forthcoming paper, we will treat the case of unbounded domains, where singular asymptotic behavior should also be prescribed at infinity, and we will apply these results to the rotating charged black hole problem in General Relativity, as mentioned in the first paragraph of this introduction.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let (M, g) be an m -dimensional simply connected Riemannian manifold with sectional curvatures bounded between two negative constants: $-b^2 \leq \kappa \leq -a^2 < 0$. Thus, (M, g) is a Cartan-Hadamard manifold. We first recall a few standard facts about this class of manifolds taken mostly from [3] and [5]. Throughout, all geodesics are unit speed. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (M, g)$ be a geodesic. The Busemann function associated with γ is defined by:

$$f_\gamma(p) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\text{dist}(p, \gamma(t)) - t).$$

This is the *renormalized* distance function from the ideal point $\gamma(+\infty) \in \partial M$. As such, it inherits many of the properties of $\text{dist}(\cdot, q)$, the distance function from a fixed point q . In particular, it is convex, and its gradient has length 1:

$$\begin{aligned} (2) \quad & |\nabla f_\gamma| = 1, \\ (3) \quad & \nabla^2 f_\gamma \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $f_\gamma \in C^2(M)$, and the level sets $\mathcal{S}_\gamma(t) = \{p \in M : f_\gamma(p) = t\}$, called *horospheres*, are C^2 -diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{m-1}$.

Denote the reverse geodesic $t \mapsto \gamma(-t)$ by $-\gamma$. To be consistent with the notation used later, we now use $-\gamma$ in place of γ . Let $v_0: \mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$ be a C^2 -global coordinate system on $\mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(0)$ centered at $\gamma(0)$. From (2), it follows that the integral curves of $\nabla f_{-\gamma}$, the field of unit normals to the horospheres, are geodesics. Let ϕ_t be the flow generated by this vector field, then ϕ_{-t} maps $\mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(t)$ to $\mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(0)$, and $v_t = v_0 \cdot \phi_{-t}$ is a C^1 -coordinate system on $\mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(t)$. Define $v: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$ by $v|_{\mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(t)} = v_t$, and let $u = f_{-\gamma}$, then $\phi = (u, v): M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a C^1 -coordinate system on M . In this coordinate system, the metric g can be written as:

$$ds^2 = du^2 + Q_p(dv),$$

where, for each $p \in M$, Q_p is a positive quadratic form on $\mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, and Q_p is continuous in p . Specific examples of this construction are given in Lemma 6. From (3), it is easily seen that for each non-zero $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, and each fixed $v \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, $Q_{\phi^{-1}(u,v)}(\xi)$ is a positive continuous increasing function of u .

We now wish to sharpen this result in the lemma below. Following [5], we will say that a Jacobi field Y along a geodesic γ is *stable as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$* if it is bounded for $\pm t \geq 0$. For each $v \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, let γ_v denote the geodesic $t \mapsto \phi^{-1}(t, v)$, and note that $\gamma_0 = \gamma$.

Lemma 1. *For every $v \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, and every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, there holds:*

$$(4) \quad 2a Q_{\gamma_v(t)}(\xi) \leq \frac{d}{dt} (Q_{\gamma_v(t)}(\xi)) \leq 2b Q_{\gamma_v(t)}(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}.$$

Proof. We first make the following observation. Fix $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, let $\bar{\xi} = (0, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and define $Y_\xi = d\phi^{-1} \cdot \bar{\xi}$. Then, $Y_\xi \perp \dot{\gamma}_v$ everywhere, and Y_ξ is a Jacobi field along γ_v which is stable as $t \rightarrow -\infty$. To see this it suffices to note that for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the curve $t \mapsto \phi^{-1}(t, v + s\xi)$ is the geodesic $\gamma_{v+s\xi}$, Y_ξ is the variation vector field of this family, and $\text{dist}(\gamma_{v+s\xi}(t), \gamma_v(t))$ is bounded for $t \leq 0$. Since

$$Q_p(\xi) = g(d\phi^{-1}|_{\phi(p)} \cdot \bar{\xi}, d\phi^{-1}|_{\phi(p)} \cdot \bar{\xi}) = g(Y_\xi(p), Y_\xi(p)),$$

we see that (4) is simply an estimate on the logarithmic growth rate of stable Jacobi fields in (M, g) . Fix $v \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, and let

$$\chi(t) = Q_{\gamma_v(t)}(\xi) = g(Y_\xi, Y_\xi)|_{\gamma_v(t)}.$$

In [5], a pointwise estimate is proved which in our notation reads:

$$(5) \quad e^{2a(t-s)} \chi(s) \leq \chi(t) \leq e^{2b(t-s)} \chi(s),$$

for all $s \leq t$. The lemma follows by taking logarithms, dividing by $t - s$, and letting $t \rightarrow s^+$. $\square$

Two geodesics γ and γ' are said to be *asymptotic* if $\text{dist}(\gamma(t), \gamma'(t))$ is bounded for $t \geq 0$. This is clearly an equivalence relation. The boundary ∂M of (M, g) is defined to be the set of equivalence classes of geodesics in (M, g) . We denote the equivalence class of γ in ∂M by $\gamma(+\infty)$. Since the sectional curvatures of (M, g) are pinched between two negative constants, there is for each pair $\omega \neq \omega' \in \partial M$ a

geodesic from ω to ω' unique up to translation. We also write $\gamma(-\infty)$ for $-\gamma(+\infty)$. As a corollary of Lemma 1 we note the following:

Lemma 2. *Let γ and β be geodesics in (M, g) such that $\gamma(-\infty) = \beta(-\infty)$, parameterized so that $f_{-\gamma} = f_{-\beta}$. Then*

$$(6) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \text{dist}(\gamma(t), \beta(t)) = 0.$$

Proof. With the coordinate system ϕ defined above, we may assume that $\beta = \gamma_v$ for some $v \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$. For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, define the curve $\sigma_t: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ by $\sigma_t(s) = \phi^{-1}(t, sv)$ for $0 \leq s \leq 1$. We have $\sigma_t(0) = \gamma(t)$ and $\sigma_t(1) = \beta(t)$, hence if $d(t) = \text{dist}(\gamma(t), \beta(t))$, clearly $d(t) \leq$ the length of σ_t , and therefore

$$(d(t))^2 \leq \int_0^1 g(\dot{\sigma}, \dot{\sigma}) = \int_0^1 Q_{\sigma_t(s)}(v).$$

Denoting the integral on the right-hand side by $h(t)$, then Lemma 1 implies that

$$\frac{dh}{dt} \geq 2ah,$$

which gives $h(t) \leq e^{2at}h(0)$ for all $t \leq 0$. The lemma follows. $\square$

The *horoball* associated with γ is defined by:

$$\mathcal{B}_\gamma(t) = \{p \in M : f_\gamma(p) \leq t\}.$$

Denote the closed geodesic ball of radius $R > 0$ centered at $p \in M$ by $B_R(p)$.

We have the following lemmas:

Lemma 3. *Let γ be a geodesic in (M, g) . Then for any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and any $T \geq 0$, we have*

$$\mathcal{B}_\gamma(-t_0 + T) \cap \mathcal{B}_{-\gamma}(t_0 + T) \subset B_R(\gamma(t_0)),$$

where $R = T + a^{-1} \log 2$.

Proof. We first remark that, by shifting the parameter along γ , we may without loss of generality assume that $t_0 = 0$. We use the following comparison principle which is proved in [5, Lemma 4.2]:

Let β be any geodesic in (M, g) , and let $\chi = f_\gamma \cdot \beta$. Similarly, let χ_a be the restriction of a Busemann function along a geodesic in a space of constant curvature $-a^2$. Suppose that $\chi(0) = \chi_a(0)$, and that $\dot{\chi}(0) = \dot{\chi}_a(0)$. Then, $\chi(t) \geq \chi_a(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$.

We note that $\dot{\chi}(0) = \cos \theta$, where θ is the angle between $\dot{\gamma}(0)$, and $\dot{\beta}(0)$. Let $p \in \mathcal{B}_\gamma(T) \cap \mathcal{B}_{-\gamma}(T)$, and let β be the geodesic from $\gamma(0)$ to p . Let θ be the angle between $\dot{\beta}(0)$ and $\dot{\gamma}(0)$, and assume first that $\theta \geq \pi/2$. Then by the comparison principle above, we have

$$\frac{1}{a} \log(e^{ar} \sin^2(\theta/2) + e^{-ar} \cos^2(\theta/2)) \leq f_\gamma(p) \leq T,$$

where $r = \text{dist}(p, \gamma(0))$. Consequently, we obtain $r \leq T + a^{-1} \log 2$. Now, if $\theta < \pi/2$, then $\pi - \theta$, the angle between $\dot{\beta}(0)$ and $-\dot{\gamma}(0)$, is $> \pi/2$, and a similar estimate using $f_{-\gamma}$ gives $r \leq T + a^{-1} \log 2$ again. The lemma follows. $\square$

Lemma 4. *Let γ and β be geodesics in (M, g) , such that $\beta(-\infty) = \gamma(-\infty)$ and $\beta(+\infty) \neq \gamma(+\infty)$. Then for some $d \in \mathbb{R}$:*

$$(7) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (f_{-\gamma} - f_{\gamma}) \cdot \beta(t) = d,$$

$$(8) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} (f_{-\gamma} + f_{\gamma}) \cdot \beta(t) = 0.$$

Proof. Let $\chi = f_{-\gamma} \cdot \beta$, and $\bar{\chi} = f_{\gamma} \cdot \beta$. We have $\dot{\chi} = 1$, while $\dot{\bar{\chi}} \leq 1$. Thus, $\chi - \bar{\chi}$ is non-decreasing and to prove (7) it remains to show that it is bounded above. Let p be the unique point where β intersects $S_{-\gamma}(0)$. Then, for t large enough $\chi(t) = \text{dist}(p, \beta(t))$. Also, $\bar{\chi} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$, hence there is $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ where $\bar{\chi}$ has its minimum, and at this point $\dot{\beta}(t_0)$ is tangent to $S_{\gamma}(t_1)$, where $t_1 = f_{\gamma} \cdot \beta(t_0)$. For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let α_t be the unique geodesic from $\gamma(+\infty)$ to $\beta(t)$, and let q_t be the unique point where α_t intersects $S_{\gamma}(t_1)$. Then, for t large enough, $\bar{\chi}(t) = \text{dist}(q_t, \beta(t)) - t_1$, and from the triangle inequality, we obtain that $\chi(t) - \bar{\chi}(t) \leq \text{dist}(p, q_t) + t_1$. By Theorem 4.9 in [5], q_t lies in a compact set, hence $\chi - \bar{\chi}$ is bounded above, and (7) follows. Now, note that for any $p \in M$, we have by the triangle inequality

$$[\text{dist}(p, \gamma(-t)) - t] + [\text{dist}(p, \gamma(t)) - t] \geq 0,$$

hence $\chi + \bar{\chi} \geq 0$. Also $\dot{\bar{\chi}} \geq -1$, thus $\chi + \bar{\chi}$ is non-decreasing, and we deduce that $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} (\chi + \bar{\chi}) \geq 0$. It remains to show that $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} (\chi + \bar{\chi}) \leq 0$. We may assume that β is parameterized so that $f_{-\gamma} = f_{-\beta}$. For any $s < t \leq 0$, we have by the triangle inequality:

$$[\text{dist}(\beta(t), \gamma(-s)) - s] + [\text{dist}(\beta(t), \gamma(s)) - s] \leq 2 \text{dist}(\beta(t), \gamma(t)),$$

hence, taking the limit $s \rightarrow \infty$, we find $\chi(t) + \bar{\chi}(t) \leq 2 \text{dist}(\beta(t), \gamma(t))$. Since by Lemma 2, $\text{dist}(\beta(t), \gamma(t)) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow -\infty$, Equation (8) follows. $\square$

Remark. From the proof it follows that since $\chi - \bar{\chi}$ is non-decreasing, the following inequality holds:

$$(9) \quad \chi(0) - \bar{\chi}(0) \leq \chi(t) - \bar{\chi}(t) \leq d, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Lemma 5. *Let γ be a geodesic in (M, g) . Then, for any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and any $T \geq (2a)^{-1} \log 2$, we have*

$$g(\nabla f_{\gamma}(p), \nabla f_{-\gamma}(p)) > 0, \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{S}_{\gamma}(-t_0 + T) \setminus \mathcal{B}_{-\gamma}(t_0 + T).$$

Proof. It is clearly enough to prove the lemma for $T = t_0 = (2a)^{-1} \log 2$. Let $p \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma(0) \setminus \mathcal{B}_{-\gamma}(a^{-1} \log 2)$, and let α be the unique geodesic from $\gamma(-\infty)$ through p parameterized so that $\alpha(0) \in \mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(0)$. Let $\bar{\chi} = f_\gamma \cdot \alpha$, then $\dot{\bar{\chi}} = g(\nabla f_\gamma, \nabla f_{-\gamma})$. Now, $\bar{\chi}$ is convex hence has at most two zeros $t_1 \leq t_2$, and $\dot{\bar{\chi}}(t_1) \leq 0$. Let $q = \alpha(t_1)$. We will show that $t_1 \leq a^{-1} \log 2$. That proves the lemma since then $f_{-\gamma}(q) = t_1 \leq a^{-1} \log 2 < f_{-\gamma}(p)$, hence $p = \alpha(t_2)$ where by the convexity of $\bar{\chi}$, we have

$$g(\nabla f_\gamma(p), \nabla f_{-\gamma}(p)) = \dot{\bar{\chi}}(t_2) > 0.$$

Let β be the unique geodesic from $\gamma(\infty)$ through q parameterized so that $\beta(0) = q$. Let $\chi = f_{-\gamma} \cdot \beta$, then $\chi(0) = t_1$. Thus, if θ is the angle between β and $\nabla f_{-\gamma}$, we have $\cos \theta = \dot{\chi}(0) = \dot{\bar{\chi}}(t_1) \leq 0$. It follows that $\theta \geq \pi/2$, or equivalently $\sin^2(\theta/2) \geq 1/2$. Since $f_\gamma \cdot \beta(0) = 0$, we have $f_\gamma \cdot \beta(t) = t$, and therefore $\chi(t) + t = (f_{-\gamma} + f_\gamma) \cdot \beta(t)$. By Lemma 4, Equation (7), we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} (\chi(t) + t) = 0.$$

However, by the comparison principle in Lemma 3, we have

$$\chi(t) + t \geq \chi(0) + a^{-1} \log \sin^2(\theta/2) + a^{-1} \log(1 + e^{at} \cot^2(\theta/2)).$$

It follows that $t_1 = \chi(0) \leq -a^{-1} \log \sin^2(\theta/2) \leq a^{-1} \log 2$. $\square$

In order to obtain the next lemma, which is a key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1, we now assume that (M, g) is a classical Riemannian globally symmetric space of rank one and of non-compact type. Thus, (M, g) is $\mathbb{H}_\mathbb{K}^\ell$, where $\ell \geq 2$, and $\mathbb{K}$ is either $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$ or the quaternions $\mathbb{H}$. It is well-known that (M, g) is simply connected, and when scaled appropriately has sectional curvatures between -4 and -1 , see [6]. Thus all of the above considerations apply. We note that when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, $m = \dim M = \ell$, while when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, $m = 2\ell$, and when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{H}$, $m = 4\ell$. Let $\mathfrak{S}$ denote the sum over cyclic permutations of the indices $\{1, 2, 3\}$.

Lemma 6. *Let $(M, g) = \mathbb{H}_\mathbb{K}^\ell$, where $\ell \geq 2$, and $\mathbb{K}$ is either $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{H}$. Then there is an analytic coordinate system $\phi = (u, v)$ on (M, g) , with $u = f_{-\gamma}$, such that the metric g is given in this coordinate system by the following line elements.*

When $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$:

$$(10) \quad ds^2 = du^2 + e^{2u} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} dv_k^2.$$

When $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$:

$$(11) \quad ds^2 = du^2 + e^{4u} \left(dv_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (v_{2k} dv_{2k+1} - v_{2k+1} dv_{2k}) \right)^2 + e^{2u} \sum_{k=2}^{2\ell-1} dv_k^2.$$

When $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{H}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 ds^2 &= du^2 \\
 (12) \quad &+ e^{4u} \mathfrak{S} \left(dv_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (v_{4k} dv_{4k+1} - v_{4k+1} dv_{4k} - v_{4k+2} dv_{4k+3} + v_{4k+3} dv_{4k+2}) \right)^2 \\
 &+ e^{2u} \sum_{k=4}^{4\ell-1} dv_k^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

In this coordinate system, the following holds.

- (i) Let $R > 0$, and let γ' be a geodesic such that $\gamma'(-\infty) = \gamma(-\infty)$. Then there exists $c \geq 1$ such that for all $t_0 \geq 0$, and all $p \in B_R(\gamma'(t_0))$, there holds:

$$(13) \quad \frac{1}{c} Q_{\gamma'(t_0)}(\xi) \leq Q_p(\xi) \leq c Q_{\gamma'(t_0)}(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}.$$

- (ii) For all $t, t' \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(t) \cap \mathcal{B}_{\gamma'}(t')$ is star-shaped in this coordinates with respect to its ‘center’, the unique point where γ' intersects $\mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(t)$.

Proof. The construction of the coordinate system ϕ , and the derivation of Equations (10)–(12) is, although straightforward, quite tedious. We defer it to the appendix. We turn to the proof of (i). Note first that if $p = \gamma'(t)$, then $|t - t_0| \leq \text{dist}(p, \gamma'(t_0)) \leq R$, and hence (13) holds with $c = e^{4R}$. Thus it suffices to prove (13) with $\gamma'(t_0)$ replaced by $\gamma'(t)$, where $t = f_{-\gamma}(p)$, i.e.

$$(14) \quad \frac{1}{c'} Q_{\gamma'(t)}(\xi) \leq Q_p(\xi) \leq c' Q_{\gamma'(t)}(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}.$$

This will imply (13) with $c = e^{4R}c'$. To prove (14), consider first the case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$. In view of Equation (10), $Q_p(\xi)$ is constant on the horospheres, hence there is nothing to prove. Now consider the case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$. We may assume that $\phi \cdot \gamma'(t) = (t, w)$, where $w = (w_1, \dots, w_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$ is constant. Note that the map $\tau_{-t}: (M, g) \rightarrow (M, g)$ given by:

$$\phi \cdot \tau_{-t} \cdot \phi^{-1}(u, v) = (u - t, e^{2t}v_1, e^t v_2, \dots, e^t v_{m-1}),$$

is an isometry, and $\tau_{-t}(\gamma'(t)) = \gamma'(0)$. Also, if $p \in B_R(\gamma'(t_0)) \cap \mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(t)$, then $\text{dist}(p, \gamma'(t)) \leq \text{dist}(p, \gamma'(t_0)) + \text{dist}(\gamma'(t_0), \gamma'(t)) \leq 2R$, hence $p \in B_{2R}(\gamma'(t)) \cap \mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(t)$. Thus, $\tau_{-t}(p) \in B_{2R}(\gamma'(0))$. In particular, there is a constant $C > 0$, independent of t , such that $e^t |v_k - w_k| \leq C$ for $2 \leq k \leq m-1$. Using (11), we can therefore

estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_p(\xi) &= e^{4t} \left(\xi_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (v_{2k} \xi_{2k+1} - v_{2k+1} \xi_{2k}) \right)^2 + e^{2t} \sum_{k=2}^{m-1} \xi_k^2 \\
&\leq 2e^{4t} \left(\xi_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (w_{2k} \xi_{2k+1} - w_{2k+1} \xi_{2k}) \right)^2 + e^{2t} \sum_{k=2}^{m-1} \xi_k^2 \\
&\quad + 4e^{4t} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} \left((v_{2k} - w_{2k})^2 \xi_{2k+1}^2 + (v_{2k+1} - w_{2k+1})^2 \xi_{2k}^2 \right) \\
&\leq c' Q_{\gamma'(t)}(\xi),
\end{aligned}$$

with $c' = \max\{2, 4C^2 + 1\}$. The other inequality follows by interchanging v and w . The case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{H}$ is proved similarly. It remains to prove (ii). Observe that there is a subgroup N of the group of isometries of (M, g) which leaves each horosphere $\mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(t)$ invariant, is transitive on each $\mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(t)$, and is linear in v . For instance, when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, these isometries $\tau \in N$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi \cdot \tau \cdot \phi^{-1}(u, v) &= \\
&= (u, v_1 + w_1 - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (w_{2k} v_{2k+1} - w_{2k+1} v_{2k}), v_2 + w_2, \dots, v_{m-1} + w_{m-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $w = (w_1, \dots, w_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$ is an arbitrary constant. The case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{H}$ is similar, and the case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ is trivial. Thus, we can find such an isometry $\tau \in N$ which maps γ' onto γ , and leaves $f_{-\gamma}$ invariant. Since τ maps ‘lines’ $\phi^{-1}(u, v + tw)$ to ‘lines’ $\phi^{-1}(u, tv)$, we deduce that it suffices to check (ii) for γ only. The Busemann function f_γ is computed in the appendix. Set $\bar{u} = f_\gamma \cdot \phi^{-1}$, then we have

$$(15) \quad e^{2\bar{u}} = \begin{cases} \left(e^{-u} + e^u \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} v_k^2 \right)^2 & \text{when } \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}, \\ \left(e^{-u} + e^u \sum_{k=2}^{m-1} v_k^2 \right)^2 + 4e^{2u} v_1^2 & \text{when } \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}, \\ \left(e^{-u} + e^u \sum_{k=4}^{m-1} v_k^2 \right)^2 + 4e^{2u} (v_1^2 + v_2^2 + v_3^2) & \text{when } \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{H}. \end{cases}$$

Now it is clear from Equation (15) that $\bar{u}$ is monotonically increasing with respect to $|v|$, hence (ii) follows. $\square$

Remark. In the proof of Theorem 1, we only use (i) and (ii) of Lemma 6. It would be interesting to see whether these generalize to other simply connected manifolds with pinched negative curvature. We note that, according to the proof of Theorem 1, it suffices to have (i) and (ii) for sufficiently large t ’s.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be a bounded domain with $\partial\Omega$ of class $C^{2,\alpha}$, and let Σ be a closed smooth submanifold of Ω of co-dimension at least 2, possibly with $\partial\Sigma \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 1. Let γ be a geodesic in (M, g) . We say that a harmonic map $\varphi \in C^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma; M) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Sigma; M)$ is a Σ -singular map into γ if

- (i) $\varphi(\Omega \setminus \Sigma) \subset \gamma(\mathbb{R})$
- (ii) $\varphi(x) \rightarrow \gamma(+\infty)$ as $x \rightarrow \Sigma$
- (iii) There is a constant $\delta > 0$ such that $|d\varphi(x)|^2 \geq \delta \operatorname{dist}(x, \Sigma)^{-2}$ in a neighborhood of Σ .

Let μ be any positive measure on Σ , and let Γ be the fundamental solution in Ω , then the convolution $u = \mu * \Gamma$ is a harmonic function on $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$ which tends to infinity on Σ , and hence $\varphi = \gamma \cdot u$ satisfies (i) and (ii). Conversely, if φ is a Σ -singular map into γ , then there is a harmonic function u on $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$ such that $\varphi = \gamma \cdot u$, and $u = \mu * \Gamma - u'$ for some positive measure μ on Σ , and some smooth harmonic function u' on Ω . Since $\varphi = \gamma \cdot u$ implies $|d\varphi|^2 = |\nabla u|^2$, condition (iii) can be obtained for example if the measure μ is bounded below by a positive constant δ times the surface measure of Σ . Note that if u and u' are harmonic functions on $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$, and $u - u'$ is a smooth harmonic function on Ω , then $\gamma \cdot u$ and $\gamma \cdot u'$ are asymptotic. Thus, if $\varphi = \gamma \cdot u$ is a Σ -singular map into γ , we can always assume without loss of generality that φ maps $\partial\Omega$ to $\gamma(0)$, for otherwise we can add to u a smooth harmonic function u' so that $u + u' = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. In particular, we may assume that $u > 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$.

Let $L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ be the space of measurable functions on $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$ which are essentially bounded. In analogy with geodesics we define:

Definition 2. Let $\varphi, \varphi' : \Omega \setminus \Sigma \rightarrow (M, g)$ be harmonic maps, and let $\Sigma' \subset \Sigma$. We say that φ and φ' are asymptotic near Σ' if there is a neighborhood Ω' of Σ' such that $\operatorname{dist}(\varphi, \varphi') \in L^\infty(\Omega' \setminus \Sigma')$. If $\operatorname{dist}(\varphi, \varphi') \in L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$, we say they are asymptotic.

We will also use the following two elementary lemmas. The first is an integral estimate for singular harmonic functions. The second is a simple maximum principle. For the sake of completeness, we give the proofs, although they are quite standard.

Lemma 7. Let $u \in C^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ satisfy $\Delta u = 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$, $u > 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$, and $u(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \Sigma$. Let $\partial^s = \{x \in \Omega : \operatorname{dist}(x, \Sigma) = s\}$. Then, we have:

$$(16) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial^s} u = 0.$$

Proof. First observe that for $s > 0$ small enough, ∂^s is a smooth compact surface. Let $\chi(s) = \int_{\partial^s} u \geq 0$, then we compute:

$$(17) \quad \frac{d\chi}{ds} = \int_{\partial^s} \partial_n u + \int_{\partial^s} u h,$$

where $\partial_n u$ is the derivative of u along the outward unit normal to ∂^s , and h is the mean curvature of ∂^s . Note that, since u is harmonic, the first integral is independent of $s > 0$, and define the *charge* of u :

$$e_0 = - \int_{\partial^s} \partial_n u.$$

Furthermore, since Σ is of co-dimension $k \geq 2$, we have on ∂^s for $s > 0$ small enough:

$$h \geq \frac{k-1}{s} - c_1 \geq \frac{1}{s} - c_1,$$

for some $c_1 \geq 0$. To see this, note that if X is the field of unit normals to the surfaces ∂^s , then as $s \rightarrow 0$ the dominant part in $h = \operatorname{div} X$ comes from the divergence of X in the k -planes normal to Σ which is $(k-1)/s$. Thus, from (17) we obtain the differential inequality:

$$(18) \quad \frac{d\chi}{ds} \geq -e_0 + \left(\frac{1}{s} - c_1\right) \chi.$$

Equation (16) follows from (18). To see this, note first that Inequality (18) implies that $\chi(s)$ is increasing for $s > 0$ small enough. Thus, we have $\chi(s) \leq \chi_0 = \chi(s_0)$ for $0 < s \leq s_0$. Now, introduce $t = \log s$. Then Inequality (18) becomes:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(e^{-t} \chi + (e_0 + c_1 \chi_0) t \right) \geq 0,$$

and that yields $\chi \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow -\infty$. $\square$

Lemma 8. *Let $u \in C^2(\Omega \setminus \Sigma) \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Sigma)$ satisfy $\Delta u \geq 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$, $0 \leq u \leq 1$ in $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$, and $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$. Then $u = 0$.*

Proof. For any function $\chi \in C_0^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma)$, with $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$, we have:

$$0 \geq - \int_{\Omega} \chi^2 u \Delta u = \int_{\Omega} \chi^2 |\nabla u|^2 + 2 \int_{\Omega} \chi u \nabla \chi \cdot \nabla u.$$

It follows that

$$\int_{\Omega} \chi^2 |\nabla u|^2 \leq 2 \left(\int_{\Omega} \chi^2 |\nabla u|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \chi|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

and therefore:

$$(19) \quad \int_{\Omega} \chi^2 |\nabla u|^2 \leq 4 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \chi|^2.$$

Now, let $r(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x, \Sigma)$, and for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, define

$$\chi_{\epsilon} = \begin{cases} 2 - \log r / \log \epsilon & \text{if } \epsilon^2 \leq r \leq \epsilon \\ 0 & \text{if } r \leq \epsilon^2 \\ 1 & \text{if } r \geq \epsilon. \end{cases}$$

Then $\chi_{\epsilon} \in C_0^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma)$, $0 \leq \chi_{\epsilon} \leq 1$, and

$$\nabla \chi_{\epsilon} = \begin{cases} -\frac{\nabla r}{r \log \epsilon} & \text{if } \epsilon^2 \leq r \leq \epsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $a(s)$ be the $(n-1)$ -Hausdorff measure of $\partial^s = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{dist}(x, \Sigma) = s\}$. Since Σ is of co-dimension ≥ 2 , an argument similar to the one used in Lemma 7 shows that $a(s) \leq Cs$. Thus, by the co-area formula, see [17], we have:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla \chi_\epsilon|^2 = \frac{1}{(\log \epsilon)^2} \int_{\epsilon^2}^\epsilon a(s) \frac{ds}{s^2} \leq \frac{C}{|\log \epsilon|}.$$

Substituting this into Inequality (19), we obtain:

$$\int_{\Omega} \chi_\epsilon^2 |\nabla u|^2 \leq \frac{C}{|\log \epsilon|}.$$

Now, if we let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the left hand side tends to $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2$, while the right hand side tends to zero. Consequently, u is constant, and since $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we conclude that $u = 0$. $\square$

3. THE CASE $N = 1$

In this section we prove the following proposition, which is the case $N = 1$ in Theorem 1.

Proposition 1. *Let γ be a geodesic in (M, g) , let φ_0 be a Σ -singular map into γ , and let $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\partial\Omega; M)$. Then there exists a unique harmonic map $\varphi \in C^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma; M) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Sigma; M)$ such that $\varphi = \psi$ on $\partial\Omega$, and φ is asymptotic to φ_0 .*

Proof. We begin with the uniqueness. Suppose that φ and φ' are harmonic maps which are asymptotic to φ_0 and agree with ψ on $\partial\Omega$. Then, φ and φ' are asymptotic. Let $u = (\text{dist}(\varphi, \varphi'))^2$, then, we have $u \in C^2(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Sigma)$, $\Delta u \geq 0$ on $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$, see [15], u is bounded, and vanishes on $\partial\Omega$. Thus, in view of Lemma 8, it follows that $u = 0$, hence $\varphi = \varphi'$.

To prove the existence, we set up a variational principle. Let $u = f_{-\gamma}$, and let $\phi = (u, v)$ be the corresponding coordinate system on M given in Lemma 6. Where no confusion arises, we will identify φ and its parameterization $\phi \cdot \varphi = (u, v)$. Let $\varphi_0 = \gamma \cdot u_0$, then $\varphi_0 = (u_0, 0)$, $\Delta u_0 = 0$ on $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$, and we can assume without loss of generality that $u_0 = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, and consequently $u_0 > 0$ on $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$. In addition, we know that there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(20) \quad |\nabla u_0|^2 = |d\varphi_0|^2 \geq \delta r^{-2},$$

in a neighborhood of Σ , where $r(x) = \text{dist}(x, \Sigma)$. Also, for any $\varphi: \Omega \setminus \Sigma \rightarrow M$, Q_φ is a function from $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$ with values in the positive quadratic forms on $\mathbb{R}^{m-1}$. Finally, we note that for $\Omega' \subset \Omega$:

$$E_{\Omega'}(\varphi) = \int_{\Omega'} \left\{ |\nabla u|^2 + Q_\varphi(\nabla v) \right\},$$

where $Q_\varphi(\nabla v) = \sum_{k=1}^n Q_\varphi(\nabla_k v)$.

Let $H_1(\Omega)$ be the Sobolev space of functions u such that u and $\nabla u \in L^2(\Omega)$, and let $H_{1,0}(\Omega)$ be the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in that space with respect to the norm:

$$\|u\| = \left(\int_{\Omega} \{u^2 + |\nabla u|^2\} \right)^{1/2}.$$

We define the weighted Sobolev space $H_1^{\varphi_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$ to be the space of functions $v \in L^2(\Omega \setminus \Sigma; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$ such that:

$$(21) \quad \|v\|_{\varphi_0} = \left(\int_{\Omega} \{ |v|^2 + Q_{\varphi_0}(\nabla v) \} \right)^{1/2} < \infty,$$

and we define $H_{1,0}^{\varphi_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$ to be the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$ in that space with respect to the norm (21). Note that for each $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, $Q_{\varphi_0(x)}(\xi) \geq Q_{\gamma(0)}(\xi) \geq c_1 |\xi|^2$ for some $c_1 > 0$, where the last norm is the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^{m-1}$. Thus, we have the continuous embedding $H_1^{\varphi_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1}) \hookrightarrow H_1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$. In particular, due to the Poincaré inequality in $H_{1,0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$:

$$\int_{\Omega} |v|^2 \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2, \quad \forall v \in H_{1,0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1}),$$

we have that the semi-norm:

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_0}(\nabla v) \right)^{1/2}$$

is equivalent on $H_{1,0}^{\varphi_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$ to the full norm (21). We also note the following weighted Poincaré inequality in $H_{1,0}^{\varphi_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$, compare with [19, Lemma 1]:

Lemma 9. *For every $v \in H_{1,0}^{\varphi_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$, there holds:*

$$(22) \quad \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_0}(v) |\nabla u_0|^2 \leq a^{-2} \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_0}(\nabla v).$$

Proof of Lemma 9. By a standard density argument, it suffices to prove (22) for every $v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$, and by extending v to be zero outside Ω , we may assume that $v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$. Let $S_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : u_0(x) = t\}$, then for t large enough, by (20), S_t is a smooth hypersurface, with interior unit normal $|\nabla u_0|^{-1} \nabla u_0$. Since for t large enough, we have $v = 0$ on S_t , we obtain:

$$\int_{B_t} \operatorname{div}(Q_{\varphi_0}(v) \nabla u_0) = \int_{S_t} Q_{\varphi_0}(v) |\nabla u_0| = 0,$$

where $B_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : u_0(x) \leq t\}$. Furthermore, in view of (4) Lemma 1, we can estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(Q_{\varphi_0}(v) \nabla u_0) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial u}(Q_{\varphi_0}(v)) |\nabla u_0|^2 + 2 Q_{\varphi_0}(v, \nabla v) \nabla u_0 \\ &\geq a Q_{\varphi_0}(v) |\nabla u_0|^2 - a^{-1} Q_{\varphi_0}(\nabla v). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we conclude that for t large enough, there holds:

$$\int_{B_t} Q_{\varphi_0}(v) |\nabla u_0|^2 \leq a^{-2} \int_{B_t} Q_{\varphi_0}(\nabla v).$$

The lemma follows by taking $t \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

Now, extend ψ to a map $\tilde{\psi} \in C^\infty(\Omega; M) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}; M)$ which maps a neighborhood of Σ to the point $\gamma(0)$, and write $\tilde{\psi} = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})$. Then $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = (0, 0)$ in a neighborhood of Σ . Define $\mathcal{H}$ to be the space of maps $\varphi = (u, v): \Omega \setminus \Sigma \rightarrow (M, g)$ such that $\text{dist}(\varphi, \varphi_0) \in L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$, $u - u_0 - \tilde{u} \in H_{1,0}(\Omega)$, and $v - \tilde{v} \in H_{1,0}^{\varphi_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$.

For maps $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$, and $\Omega' \subset \Omega$, we define:

$$F_{\Omega'}(\varphi) = \int_{\Omega'} \left\{ |\nabla(u - u_0)|^2 + Q_\varphi(\nabla v) \right\},$$

and we set $F = F_\Omega$. Note that $F \geq 0$, and Lemma 10 below implies that $F < \infty$ on $\mathcal{H}$. We first show that if $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ is a minimizer of F , then φ is a harmonic map on $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$, hence $\varphi \in C^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma; M) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega} \setminus \Sigma; M)$, and φ is asymptotic to φ_0 . Indeed, let $\Omega' \subset \subset \Omega \setminus \Sigma$, then we claim that for any map $\varphi' \in C^1(\Omega'; M)$ of finite energy such that $\varphi' = \varphi$ on $\partial\Omega'$, we have $E_{\Omega'}(\varphi) \leq E_{\Omega'}(\varphi')$. To see this, note that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\Omega'}(\varphi) - F_{\Omega'}(\varphi) &= \int_{\Omega'} \nabla(2u - u_0) \cdot \nabla u_0 \\ &= \int_{\Omega'} \text{div}((2u - u_0) \nabla u_0) \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega'} (2u - u_0) \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial n} \\ &= E_{\Omega'}(\varphi') - F_{\Omega'}(\varphi'). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if instead we had $E_{\Omega'}(\varphi') < E_{\Omega'}(\varphi)$, then also $F_{\Omega'}(\varphi') < F_{\Omega'}(\varphi)$ would hold. Then the map φ'' defined by:

$$\varphi''(x) = \begin{cases} \varphi(x) & \text{if } x \notin \Omega' \\ \varphi'(x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega' \end{cases}$$

would satisfy $\varphi'' \in \mathcal{H}$ and $F(\varphi'') < F(\varphi)$, in contradiction to φ being a minimizer. Thus φ is a critical point of $E_{\Omega'}$, and it follows that φ is harmonic. The interior regularity statement is standard. Clearly, $\varphi = \psi$ on $\partial\Omega$, hence the boundary regularity statement follows. Therefore, to prove Proposition 1, it suffices to show that F has a minimizer in $\mathcal{H}$.

For any $R > 0$, define the space $\mathcal{H}_R$ of maps $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ for which $\text{dist}(\varphi, \varphi_0) \leq R$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma$. We first show that F has a minimizer on $\mathcal{H}_R$. For this purpose, we will need the following lemma:

Lemma 10. *Let $R > 0$, then there is $c \geq 1$ such that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_R$, there holds:*

$$(23) \quad \frac{1}{c} Q_{\varphi_0(x)}(\xi) \leq Q_{\varphi(x)}(\xi) \leq c Q_{\varphi_0(x)}(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}, \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma$$

Proof of Lemma 10. For every $x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma$ such that $\text{dist}((\varphi(x), \varphi_0(x)) \leq R$, we have $\varphi(x) \in B_R(\varphi_0(x))$, and there is $t \geq 0$ such that $\varphi_0(x) = \gamma(t)$. Thus the lemma follows from (i) in Lemma 6. $\square$

Now, let $\varphi_j = (u_j, v_j) \in \mathcal{H}_R$ be a minimizing sequence. Then $u_j - u_0$ is bounded in $H_1(\Omega)$, and by passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $u_j - u_0$ converges weakly and pointwise a.e. in Ω to $u - u_0 \in H_1(\Omega)$. Clearly, we have

$$(24) \quad \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u - u_0)|^2 \leq \liminf \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u_j - u_0)|^2,$$

and $u - u_0 - \tilde{u} \in H_{1,0}(\Omega)$. Now, it follows from (23) that $v_j - \tilde{v}$ is bounded in $H_{1,0}^{\varphi_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_0}(\nabla v_j - \nabla \tilde{v}) &\leq 2c \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_j}(\nabla v_j) + 2 \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_0}(\nabla \tilde{v}) \\ &\leq 2c (\inf_{\mathcal{H}_R} F + c_1) + 2 \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_0}(\nabla \tilde{v}), \end{aligned}$$

for some $c_1 \geq 0$. Hence by passing again to a subsequence, we may assume that $v_j - \tilde{v}$ converges weakly and pointwise a.e. in Ω to $v - \tilde{v} \in H_{1,0}^{\varphi_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$. It follows at once that $\varphi = (u, v) \in \mathcal{H}$. Furthermore, since $\varphi_j(x) \rightarrow \varphi(x)$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, we obtain that $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_R$. Thus, by Lemma 10, the quadratic form Q_{φ} is uniformly equivalent to Q_{φ_0} , hence we have:

$$(25) \quad \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v) = \lim \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v, \nabla v_j),$$

where on the right hand side, we have used Q_{φ} also for the symmetric bilinear form associated with Q_{φ} . Define

$$\chi_j = \begin{cases} \frac{Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v_j)}{Q_{\varphi_j}(\nabla v_j)} & \text{if } \nabla v_j \neq 0 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then, by (23), we have $\chi_j \leq c$, and furthermore, we claim, $\chi_j \rightarrow 1$ pointwise a.e. in Ω . To see this, suppose that $p_j = \varphi_j(x) \rightarrow p = \varphi(x)$, then we will show that $\chi_j(x) \rightarrow 1$. Since Q_p is continuous on M , we have $Q_{p_j}(\xi) \rightarrow Q_p(\xi)$ uniformly for $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{m-2}$, the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{m-1}$. Let j' be the subsequence of j 's for which $\nabla v_{j'}(x) \neq 0$. Clearly, it is sufficient to prove that $\chi_{j'}(x) \rightarrow 1$. For every j' and for each $1 \leq k \leq n$, there are $\lambda_{j'}^k \geq 0$ and $\xi_{j'}^k \in \mathbb{S}^{m-2}$, such that $\nabla_k v_{j'}(x) = \lambda_{j'}^k \xi_{j'}^k$, and $\lambda_{j'} = \max_k \lambda_{j'}^k > 0$. We see that at x , we have:

$$Q_{p_{j'}}(\nabla v_{j'}) = \sum_{k=1}^n (\lambda_{j'}^k)^2 Q_{p_{j'}}(\xi_{j'}^k) \geq (\lambda_{j'})^2 \inf_{\mathbb{S}^{m-2}} Q_{p_{j'}} \geq \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_{j'})^2 \inf_{\mathbb{S}^{m-2}} Q_p,$$

for j' large enough. Consequently, if we set $c_2 = 2 (\inf_{\mathbb{S}^{m-2}} Q_p)^{-1}$, we can conclude that:

$$|\chi_{j'}(x) - 1| \leq c_2 \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\frac{\lambda_{j'}^k}{\lambda_{j'}} \right)^2 \left| Q_p(\xi_{j'}^k) - Q_{p_{j'}}(\xi_{j'}^k) \right| \leq nc_2 \sup_{\mathbb{S}^{m-2}} |Q_p - Q_{p_{j'}}|,$$

which tends to zero when $j' \rightarrow \infty$. We can now estimate the right hand side of (25):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v, \nabla v_j) &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left(Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v) \right)^{1/2} \left(Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v_j) \right)^{1/2} \\ (26) \quad &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \chi_j Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v) \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_j}(\nabla v_j) \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The first factor on the right hand side of (26) has a limit by the Dominated Convergence Theorem:

$$(27) \quad \lim \int_{\Omega} \chi_j Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v) = \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v).$$

Combining (27) with (25) and (26), we obtain:

$$\int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v) \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v) \right)^{1/2} \left(\liminf \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_j}(\nabla v_j) \right)^{1/2},$$

from which it follows that:

$$(28) \quad \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v) \leq \liminf \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_j}(\nabla v_j).$$

In view of (24) and (28), we conclude that:

$$F(\varphi) \leq \liminf \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u_j - u_0)|^2 + \liminf \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_j}(\nabla v_j) \leq \lim F(\varphi_j) = \inf_{\mathcal{H}_R} F,$$

Hence $F(\varphi) = \inf_{\mathcal{H}_R} F$, and φ is a minimizer of F on $\mathcal{H}_R$.

It remains to prove that for some $R > 0$ large enough $\inf_{\mathcal{H}} F = \inf_{\mathcal{H}_R} F$. Clearly, it suffices to prove that $\inf_{\mathcal{H}_R} F \leq \inf_{\mathcal{H}} F$. This follows from the following lemma.

Lemma 11. *There is a constant $R > 0$ such that for every $\epsilon > 0$, and every $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$, there is $\varphi' \in \mathcal{H}_R$ such that $F(\varphi') \leq F(\varphi) + \epsilon$.*

Proof of Lemma 11. Let $\mathcal{H}^*$ be the space of maps $\varphi = (u, v) \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $v = 0$ in a neighborhood of Σ . The proof of the lemma will be divided into two steps: we will prove that (i) *given $\epsilon > 0$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$, there is $\varphi' \in \mathcal{H}^*$ such that $F(\varphi') \leq F(\varphi) + \epsilon$;* and (ii) *a constant $R > 0$ exists such that given any $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^*$, there is $\varphi' \in \mathcal{H}_R$ such that $F(\varphi') \leq F(\varphi)$.* The lemma immediately follows from (i) and (ii). To prove (i), we use the function χ_{ϵ} introduced in the proof of Lemma 8. Note that, in view of (20), we have

$$|\nabla \chi_{\epsilon}|^2 = \text{dist}(x, \Sigma)^{-2} |\log \epsilon|^{-2} \leq \delta^{-1} |\log \epsilon|^{-2} |\nabla u_0|^2.$$

Let $\varphi = (u, v) \in \mathcal{H}$, define $v_\epsilon = \chi_\epsilon v$, and $\varphi_\epsilon = (u, v_\epsilon)$, then $v_\epsilon - \tilde{v} \in H_{1,0}^{\varphi_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$, and $\varphi_\epsilon \in \mathcal{H}^*$. Furthermore, we have $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_{R'}$ for some $R' > 0$. Let $x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma$ be such that $\text{dist}(\varphi(x), \varphi_0(x)) \leq R'$, then $u(x) \leq u_0(x) + R'$. Consequently, we have $\varphi(x) \in \mathcal{B}_{-\gamma}(u_0(x) + R')$. Similarly, $\varphi(x) \in \mathcal{B}_\gamma(-u_0(x) + R')$. By (ii) in Lemma 6, this implies that $\varphi_\epsilon(x) \in \mathcal{B}_\gamma(-u_0(x) + R')$, and therefore $\varphi_\epsilon(x) \in \mathcal{B}_{-\gamma}(u_0(x) + R') \cap \mathcal{B}_\gamma(-u_0(x) + R')$. It follows by Lemma 3 that $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_{R''}$ where $R'' = R' + a^{-1} \log 2$. Now, we have

$$(29) \quad \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_\epsilon}(\nabla v_\epsilon) = \int_{\Omega} \chi_\epsilon^2 Q_{\varphi_\epsilon}(\nabla v) + I_\epsilon,$$

where

$$|I_\epsilon| \leq \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_\epsilon}(v^2) |\nabla \chi_\epsilon|^2 + 2 \left(\int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_\epsilon}(v^2) |\nabla \chi_\epsilon|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\Omega} \chi_\epsilon^2 Q_{\varphi_\epsilon}(\nabla v) \right)^{1/2}.$$

By Lemma 10, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_\epsilon}(v^2) |\nabla \chi_\epsilon|^2 \leq c \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_0}(v^2) |\nabla \chi_\epsilon|^2 \leq c \delta^{-1} |\log \epsilon|^{-2} \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_0}(v^2) |\nabla u_0|^2,$$

which, in view of Lemma 9, tends to zero as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. It follows that $|I_\epsilon| \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Hence, since $\chi_\epsilon^2 Q_{\varphi_\epsilon}(\nabla v) \rightarrow Q_\varphi(\nabla v)$, and since $\chi_\epsilon^2 Q_{\varphi_\epsilon}(\nabla v) \leq c Q_{\varphi_0}(\nabla v)$, we deduce from (29), by the Dominated Convergence Theorem, that:

$$\int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_\epsilon}(\nabla v_\epsilon) \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} Q_\varphi(\nabla v).$$

Therefore, (i) is obtained. We now turn to the proof of (ii). Introduce a new coordinate system $\bar{\phi} = (\bar{u}, \bar{v}): M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, where $\bar{u} = f_\gamma$. As before, the metric on (M, g) can be written as:

$$ds^2 = d\bar{u}^2 + \bar{Q}_p(d\bar{v}).$$

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^*$, and write $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = \bar{\phi} \cdot \varphi$. In $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla(u - u_0)|^2 + Q_\varphi(\nabla v) &= |\nabla u|^2 + Q_\varphi(\nabla v) + |\nabla u_0|^2 - 2 \nabla u \cdot \nabla u_0 \\ &= |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 + \bar{Q}_\varphi(\nabla \bar{v}) + |\nabla u_0|^2 - 2 \nabla u \cdot \nabla u_0 \\ &= |\nabla(\bar{u} + u_0)|^2 + \bar{Q}_\varphi(\nabla \bar{v}) - 2 \text{div}((u + \bar{u}) \nabla u_0). \end{aligned}$$

We now integrate this identity over $\Omega^\epsilon = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \Sigma) > \epsilon\}$. If $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough, we can decompose $\partial \Omega^\epsilon$ into a disjoint union $\partial \Omega \cup \partial^\epsilon$, where $\partial^\epsilon = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \Sigma) = \epsilon\}$. We observe that if $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough, then $v = 0$, and hence $u + \bar{u} = 0$ on ∂^ϵ . Consequently, after taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain:

$$(30) \quad F(\varphi) = \int_{\Omega} \left\{ |\nabla(\bar{u} + u_0)|^2 + \bar{Q}_\varphi(\nabla \bar{v}) \right\} - 2 \int_{\partial \Omega} (u + \bar{u}) \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial n}.$$

Note that the second term can be written as:

$$2 \int_{\partial \Omega} (f_{-\gamma} + f_\gamma) \cdot \psi \left(\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial n} \right),$$

which clearly depends only on ψ and φ_0 , and hence is constant in $\mathcal{H}^*$. Let

$$\overline{u}' = -u_0 + \min\{\overline{u} + u_0, \overline{T}\},$$

where

$$\overline{T} = \sup_{\partial\Omega} \overline{u} + 1 = \sup_{\partial\Omega} (f_\gamma \cdot \psi) + 1,$$

and define φ' by $\overline{\phi} \cdot \varphi' = (\overline{u}', \overline{v})$. Then $\varphi' = \varphi$ on $\partial\Omega$, hence, in view of (30), $\varphi' \in \mathcal{H}$. Also, from (30) and the fact that $\overline{Q}_\varphi(\nabla \overline{v})$ is non-decreasing in $\overline{u}$, we have $F(\varphi') \leq F(\varphi)$. Furthermore, the estimate:

$$\overline{u}' + u_0 \leq \overline{T},$$

holds throughout Ω . This estimate can be rewritten as $f_\gamma \cdot \varphi' \leq -u_0 + \overline{T}$, or equivalently as:

$$(31) \quad \varphi'(x) \in \mathcal{B}_\gamma(-u_0(x) + \overline{T}), \quad \forall x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma.$$

Now, let $\phi \cdot \varphi' = (u', v')$, and let

$$T = \max\{\sup_{\partial\Omega} u + 1, \overline{T}, (2a)^{-1} \log 2\}.$$

Note that $\sup_{\partial\Omega} u = \sup_{\partial\Omega} f_{-\gamma} \cdot \psi$, hence T depends only on ψ and φ_0 . Define

$$u'' = u_0 + \min\{u' - u_0, T\},$$

and define φ'' by $\phi \cdot \varphi'' = (u'', v')$. Then $\varphi'' = \varphi'$ on $\partial\Omega$, hence $\varphi'' \in \mathcal{H}$. Also, from the fact that $Q_{\varphi'}(\nabla v')$ is non-decreasing in u' , we have $F(\varphi'') \leq F(\varphi') \leq F(\varphi)$. Furthermore, the estimate:

$$u'' - u_0 \leq T,$$

holds throughout Ω . This estimate can be rewritten as $f_{-\gamma} \cdot \varphi'' \leq u_0 + T$, or equivalently as:

$$(32) \quad \varphi''(x) \in \mathcal{B}_{-\gamma}(u_0(x) + T), \quad \forall x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma.$$

We claim that:

$$(33) \quad \varphi''(x) \in \mathcal{B}_\gamma(-u_0(x) + T), \quad \forall x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma$$

holds still. Indeed, if $x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma$ is such that $u'(x) - u_0(x) \leq T$, then $\varphi''(x) = \varphi'(x)$, hence (33) follows directly from (31). On the other hand, if $x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma$ is such that $u'(x) - u_0(x) > T$. Then, taking $t_0 = u_0(x)$, we find:

$$\varphi'(x) \in \mathcal{B}_\gamma(-t_0 + T) \setminus \mathcal{B}_{-\gamma}(t_0 + T).$$

Let $\beta = -\gamma_{v'(x)}$ be the geodesic through $\varphi'(x)$ to $\gamma(-\infty)$, then $\varphi''(x)$ is the unique point where β intersects $\mathcal{S}_{-\gamma}(t_0 + T)$. Thus, to prove the claim, it suffices to check that β enters $\mathcal{B}_{-\gamma}(t_0 + T)$ before it leaves $\mathcal{B}_\gamma(-t_0 + T)$. The claim now follows easily from Lemma 5. Indeed, suppose to the contrary that β left $\mathcal{B}_\gamma(-t_0 + T)$ before it entered $\mathcal{B}_{-\gamma}(t_0 + T)$, then it would do so at a point $p \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma(-t_0 + T) \setminus \mathcal{B}_{-\gamma}(t_0 + T)$. However, at such a point p , it follows from Lemma 5 that β points inwards into

$\mathcal{B}_\gamma(-t_0 + T)$, a contradiction. Now, from (32) and (33), and Lemma 3, we deduce that

$$\text{dist}(\varphi''(x), \varphi_0(x)) \leq R, \quad \forall x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma,$$

where $R = T + 2^{-1} \log 2$. We conclude that $\varphi'' \in \mathcal{H}_R$. This completes the proof of Lemma 11 and of Proposition 1. $\square$

Remark. We note here that the a priori estimate $\text{dist}(\varphi, \varphi_0) \leq R$ implies that $v \rightarrow 0$ on Σ . An interesting analytic question is whether the function $u - u_0$ is continuous and perhaps yet smoother in a neighborhood of Σ . The interest stems from the fact that the ellipticity of the equations degenerates near Σ . When $(M, g) = \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{R}}^2$, this regularity question was studied in the axially symmetric case in [18, 19], and in the general case in [9, 10]. This question is not addressed here.

4. THE CASE $N \geq 2$

In this section, we finish the proof of Theorem 1 by proving:

Proposition 2. *Let $N \geq 2$, and for $1 \leq i \leq N$ let φ_i be a Σ_i -singular map into γ_i , and let $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\partial\Omega; M)$. Then, there exists a unique harmonic map $\varphi \in C^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma; M) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Sigma; M)$ such that $\varphi = \psi$ on $\partial\Omega$, and φ is asymptotic to φ_i near Σ_i for each $1 \leq i \leq N$.*

Proof. The proof of Proposition 2 follows the same outline as the proof of Proposition 1, but there are a few more technical points. Let $\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be an open cover of Ω such that $\Sigma_i \subset \Omega_i$, and $\Sigma_i \cap \Omega_{i'} = \emptyset$ for $i \neq i'$. Suppose φ and φ' are harmonic maps which are asymptotic to φ_i near Σ_i for each $1 \leq i \leq N$, and agree with ψ on $\partial\Omega$. Then, $\text{dist}(\varphi, \varphi') \in L^\infty(\Omega_i \setminus \Sigma_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq N$, hence $\text{dist}(\varphi, \varphi') \in L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$. Thus, as in the proof of Proposition 1, it follows that $\varphi = \varphi'$.

We now turn to the proof of existence. We may, without loss of generality, assume that all the geodesics γ_i have the same initial point $\gamma_1(-\infty) \in \partial M$, and are parameterized so that $f_{-\gamma_i} = f_{-\gamma_1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N$. Let $u = f_{-\gamma_1}$, and let $\phi = (u, v)$ be the corresponding coordinate system given in Lemma 6. We will as before identify φ and its parameterization $\phi \cdot \varphi = (u, v)$ where no confusion arises. Let $\varphi_i = \gamma_i \cdot u_i$, then $\varphi_i = (u_i, w_i)$, where $w_i \in \mathbb{R}$ are constants, $\Delta u_i = 0$ on $\Omega \setminus \Sigma_i$, and we assume without loss of generality that $u_i = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, and consequently $u_i > 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \Sigma_i$. In addition, we know that there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla u_i|^2 = |d\varphi_i|^2 \geq \delta r_i^{-2},$$

in a neighborhood of Σ_i , where $r_i(x) = \text{dist}(x, \Sigma_i)$. Set $u_0 = \sum_{i=1}^N u_i$.

Extend ψ to a map $\tilde{\psi} \in C^\infty(\Omega; M) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}; M)$ which for each $1 \leq i \leq N$ maps a neighborhood of Σ_i to the point $\gamma_i(0)$, and write $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = \tilde{\psi}$. Then $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = (0, w_i)$ in a neighborhood of Σ_i . Define $\mathcal{H}$ to be the space of maps $\varphi = (u, v): \Omega \setminus \Sigma \rightarrow M$ such that $u - u_0 - \tilde{u} \in H_{1,0}(\Omega)$, $v - \tilde{v} \in \cap_{i=1}^N H_{1,0}^{\varphi_i}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$, and $\text{dist}(\varphi, \varphi_i) \in L^\infty(\Omega_i \setminus \Sigma_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq N$. For maps $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$, and $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ define $F_{\Omega'}$ and F as in Proposition 1:

$$F_{\Omega'}(\varphi) = \int_{\Omega'} \left\{ |\nabla(u - u_0)|^2 + Q_\varphi(\nabla v) \right\},$$

and $F = F_\Omega$. Then, as before, if $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ is a minimizer of F , then φ is a harmonic map on $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$, hence $\varphi \in C^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Sigma; M) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Sigma; M)$, and φ is asymptotic to φ_i near Σ_i for each $1 \leq i \leq N$. Thus, to prove Proposition 2, it suffices to show that F has a minimizer $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$.

For any $R > 0$ define the space $\mathcal{H}_R$ of maps $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ which for each $1 \leq i \leq N$ satisfy $\text{dist}(\varphi, \varphi_i) \leq R$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega_i \setminus \Sigma_i$. We first show that F has a minimizer in $\mathcal{H}_R$. For this purpose, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 12. *Let $R > 0$, then there is $c > 0$ such that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_R$, there holds:*

$$(34) \quad \frac{1}{c} Q_{\varphi_i(x)}(\xi) \leq Q_{\varphi(x)}(\xi) \leq c Q_{\varphi_i(x)}(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}, \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega_i \setminus \Sigma_i.$$

Proof of Lemma 12. The lemma follows immediately from (i) in Lemma 6, see the proof of Lemma 10. $\square$

Now, let $\varphi'_j = (u'_j, v'_j) \in \mathcal{H}_R$ be a minimizing sequence. Then, as before, $u'_j - u_0$ is bounded in $H_1(\Omega)$, and we may assume that it converges weakly and pointwise a.e. in Ω to $u - u_0 \in H_1(\Omega)$. Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u - u_0)|^2 \leq \liminf \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u'_j - u_0)|^2,$$

and $u - u_0 - \tilde{u} \in H_{1,0}(\Omega)$. We claim that $v'_j - \tilde{v}$ is bounded in $H_{1,0}^{\varphi_i}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$ for each $1 \leq i \leq N$. To see this, note first that in view of Lemma 12, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_i} Q_{\varphi_i}(\nabla v'_j - \nabla \tilde{v}) &\leq 2c \int_{\Omega_i} Q_{\varphi'_j}(\nabla v'_j) + 2 \int_{\Omega_i} Q_{\varphi_i}(\nabla \tilde{v}) \\ &\leq 2c (\inf_{\mathcal{H}_R} F + c_2) + 2 \int_{\Omega_i} Q_{\varphi_i}(\nabla \tilde{v}) \\ &\leq 2c (\inf_{\mathcal{H}_R} F + c_2) + 2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_i}(\nabla \tilde{v}), \end{aligned}$$

for some $c_2 \geq 0$. Denote the constant on the right-hand side by c_3 . Now u_i is bounded in $\Omega_{i'} \setminus \Sigma_{i'}$ for $i' \neq i$. Let $t_0 = \max\{\sup_{\Omega_{i'} \setminus \Sigma_{i'}} u_i : i \neq i'\}$, then for any $x \in \Omega_{i'} \setminus \Sigma_{i'}$, and any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\varphi_i(x)}(\xi) &\leq Q_{\gamma_i(t_0)}(\xi) \leq c_4 |\xi|^2 \\ Q_{\varphi_{i'}(x)}(\xi) &\geq Q_{\gamma_{i'}(0)}(\xi) \geq c_4^{-1} |\xi|^2, \end{aligned}$$

for some $c_4 \geq 1$. Therefore, we obtain:

$$\int_{\Omega_{i'}} Q_{\varphi_i}(\nabla v'_j - \nabla \tilde{v}) \leq c_4^2 \int_{\Omega_{i'}} Q_{\varphi_{i'}}(\nabla v'_j - \nabla \tilde{v}) \leq c_4^2 c_3,$$

and it follows that:

$$\int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi_i}(\nabla v'_j - \nabla \tilde{v}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\Omega_i} Q_{\varphi_i}(\nabla v'_j - \nabla \tilde{v}) \leq c_3 + (N-1) c_3 c_4^2.$$

Since the norm on the left hand side is equivalent to the full norm on $H_{1,0}^{\varphi_i}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$, we obtain that indeed $v'_j - \tilde{v}$ is bounded in this space. Thus, we may assume that $v'_j - \tilde{v}$ converges weakly in $H_{1,0}^{\varphi_i}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$ for each $1 \leq i \leq N$, and pointwise a.e. in Ω to $v - \tilde{v} \in H_{1,0}^{\varphi_i}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$. It follows at once that $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$, and furthermore, since $\varphi'_j(x) \rightarrow \varphi(x)$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, we obtain that $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_R$. We now claim that

$$\int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v) = \lim \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v, \nabla v'_j).$$

Indeed, let $\{\chi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be a partition of unity subordinate to the cover $\{\Omega_i\}$. Then, using Lemma 12, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v) - \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v, \nabla v'_j) \right| &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^N Q_{\varphi}(\nabla(\chi_i v), \nabla v - \nabla v'_j) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \int_{\Omega} Q_{\varphi}(\nabla(\chi_i v), \nabla v - \nabla v'_j) \right| \\ &\leq c \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \int_{\Omega_i} Q_{\varphi_i}(\nabla(\chi_i v), \nabla v - \nabla v'_j) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero since certainly $v - v'_j$ tends to zero weakly in $H_{1,0}^{\varphi_i}(\Omega_i; \mathbb{R}^{m-1})$. Now, the argument in the proof of Proposition 1 applies, and we deduce that φ is a minimizer of F on $\mathcal{H}_R$.

Once more, it remains only to prove that some $R > 0$ large enough $\inf_{\mathcal{H}} F = \inf_{\mathcal{H}_R} F$. As before, we state this as a lemma.

Lemma 13. *There is a constant $R > 0$ such that for every $\epsilon > 0$, and every $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$, there is $\varphi' \in \mathcal{H}_R$ such that $F(\varphi') \leq F(\varphi) + \epsilon$.*

Proof of Lemma 13. Let $\mathcal{H}^*$ be the space of maps $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $v = w_i$ in a neighborhood of Σ_i for each i . The proof of the lemma is divided into steps (i) and (ii) as in the proof of Lemma 11. The proof of (i) is practically unchanged. We immediately turn to the proof of (ii). Introduce the new coordinate system $\overline{\phi} = (\overline{u}, \overline{v})$, where $\overline{u} = f_{\gamma_1}$. Again, write the metric on (M, g) as

$$ds^2 = d\overline{u}^2 + \overline{Q}_p(d\overline{v}).$$

Set $\overline{u}_0 = -u_1 + \sum_{i=2}^N u_i$. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^*$, and write $\overline{\phi} \cdot \varphi = (\overline{u}, \overline{v})$. Then in $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$, we find:

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla(u - u_0)|^2 + Q_{\varphi}(\nabla v) &= |\nabla(\overline{u} - \overline{u}_0)|^2 + \overline{Q}_{\varphi}(\nabla \overline{v}) \\ &\quad - 2 \nabla u \cdot \nabla u_0 + 2 \nabla \overline{u} \cdot \nabla \overline{u}_0 + |\nabla u_0|^2 - |\nabla \overline{u}_0|^2 \\ &= |\nabla(\overline{u} - \overline{u}_0)|^2 + \overline{Q}_{\varphi}(\nabla \overline{v}) - 2 \nabla(u + \overline{u}) \cdot \nabla u_1 \\ &\quad - 2 \sum_{i=2}^N \nabla(u - \overline{u}) \cdot \nabla u_i + 4 \sum_{i=2}^N \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla u_i. \end{aligned}$$

We wish to integrate this identity over Ω in order to obtain an integral identity analogous to (30). Some care must be taken due to the singularities at Σ_i . Integrate first over $\Omega^\epsilon = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \Sigma) > \epsilon\}$:

$$(35) \quad F_{\Omega^\epsilon}(\varphi) = \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} \left\{ |\nabla(\bar{u} - \bar{u}_0)|^2 + \bar{Q}_\varphi(\nabla \bar{v}) \right\} + I_1(\epsilon) + I_2(\epsilon) + I_3(\epsilon),$$

where we have set:

$$(36) \quad I_1(\epsilon) = -2 \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} \nabla(u + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla u_1 = -2 \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} \text{div}((u + \bar{u}) \nabla u_1)$$

$$(37) \quad I_2(\epsilon) = -2 \sum_{i=2}^N \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} \nabla(u - \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla u_i = -2 \sum_{i=2}^N \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} \text{div}((u - \bar{u}) \nabla u_i)$$

$$(38) \quad I_3(\epsilon) = 4 \sum_{i=2}^N \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla u_i.$$

For $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, we can decompose the boundary $\partial\Omega^\epsilon$ into a disjoint union $\cup_{i=1}^N \partial_i^\epsilon \cup \partial\Omega$, where $\partial_i^\epsilon = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \Sigma_i) = \epsilon\} \subset \Omega_i$. Integrate (36) by parts:

$$I_1(\epsilon) = -2 \int_{\partial\Omega} (u + \bar{u}) \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n} - 2 \int_{\partial_1^\epsilon} (u + \bar{u}) \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n} - 2 \sum_{i=2}^N \int_{\partial_i^\epsilon} (u + \bar{u}) \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n}.$$

For ϵ small enough, $v = 0$, and hence $u + \bar{u} = 0$ on ∂_1^ϵ , so the second term above vanishes. Let $i \geq 2$, and write $\bar{u}_i = f_{\gamma_1} \cdot \varphi_i$. Then, since $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_{R'}$ for some $R' > 0$, we have almost everywhere in $\Omega_i \setminus \Sigma_i$:

$$\begin{aligned} |u - u_i| &\leq R' \\ |\bar{u} - \bar{u}_i| &\leq R'. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 4, Equation (7), we have $u_i - \bar{u}_i \rightarrow d_i$ as $x \rightarrow \Sigma_i$, for some $d_i \in \mathbb{R}$, and from (9), we have $|u_i - \bar{u}_i| \leq D$, where

$$D = \max_{2 \leq i \leq N} \{|d_i|, |f_{-\gamma_1} \cdot \gamma_i(0) - f_{\gamma_1} \cdot \gamma_i(0)|\}.$$

Furthermore, there is a constant $c_6 > 0$ such that $|\partial u_1 / \partial n| \leq c_6$ in $\Omega_i \setminus \Sigma_i$. Consequently, taking $a_i(\epsilon)$ to be the $(n-1)$ -Hausdorff measure of ∂_i^ϵ , we can estimate:

$$(39) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\partial_i^\epsilon} (u + \bar{u}) \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n} \right| &\leq c_6 \int_{\partial_i^\epsilon} \left\{ |u_i - \bar{u}_i| + 2u_i + 2R' \right\} \\ &\leq \left((2R' + D) a_i(\epsilon) + 2 \int_{\partial_i^\epsilon} u_i \right) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, by Lemma 7. We deduce that, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$:

$$(40) \quad I_1(\epsilon) \rightarrow K_1 = -2 \int_{\partial\Omega} (u + \bar{u}) \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n},$$

which clearly depends only on ψ and φ_1 . Now, we have

$$I_2(\epsilon) = -2 \sum_{i=2}^N \int_{\partial\Omega} (u - \bar{u}) \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial n} - 2 \sum_{i=2}^N \sum_{i'=1}^N \int_{\partial_{i'}^\epsilon} (u - \bar{u}) \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial n}.$$

An estimate similar to (39) shows that all the terms in the second sum are zero except when $i' = i \geq 2$. To compute this term, let:

$$e_i = \int_{\partial_i^\epsilon} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial n},$$

be the charge of u_i , see Lemma 7. If $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough, we have for each $x \in \partial_i^\epsilon$ that $\varphi(x)$ is a point along γ_i , and $u(x) \geq u_i(x) - R'$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega_i \setminus \Sigma_i$. It follows from Lemma 4, Equation (7), that $(u - \bar{u})|_{\partial_i^\epsilon} \rightarrow d_i$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, and $|u - \bar{u}| \leq |u_i - \bar{u}_i| + 2R' \leq D + 2R'$. Also, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough $(\partial u_i / \partial n) > 0$, and clearly,

$$\int_{\partial_i^\epsilon} (D + 2R') \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial n} = (D + 2R') e_i,$$

for each $\epsilon > 0$. Thus, integrating over a representative surface $\partial_i^{\epsilon_0}$, and using Fatou's Lemma, we conclude that

$$(41) \quad \int_{\partial_i^\epsilon} (u - \bar{u}) \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial n} \rightarrow d_i e_i,$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Summing up, we have obtained that, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$:

$$(42) \quad I_2(\epsilon) \rightarrow K_2 = -2 \sum_{i=2}^N \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} (u - \bar{u}) \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial n} + d_i e_i \right\},$$

which clearly depends only on ψ and φ_i , $2 \leq i \leq N$. Now, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, and $i \geq 2$, we calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla u_i &= \int_{\Omega^\epsilon \cap \Omega_1} \operatorname{div}(u_i \nabla u_1) + \int_{\Omega^\epsilon \setminus \Omega_1} \operatorname{div}(u_1 \nabla u_i) \\ &= \int_{\partial_1} u_i \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n} + \int_{\partial_1^\epsilon} u_i \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n} + \int_{\partial_1'} u_1 \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial n} + \int_{\partial_i^\epsilon} u_1 \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial n} + \sum_{1 \neq i' \neq i} \int_{\partial_{i'}^\epsilon} u_1 \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\partial_1 = \partial(\Omega \cap \Omega_1)$, and $\partial_1' = \partial(\Omega \setminus \Omega_1)$. Since u_1 and u_i are smooth in $\Omega_{i'}$ for $1 \neq i' \neq i$, all the terms in the last sum tend to zero as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In Ω_1 , u_i is smooth, thus by an argument analogous to the one leading to (41), we have that, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$:

$$\int_{\partial_1^\epsilon} u_i \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n} \rightarrow k_1,$$

for some $k_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. Similarly:

$$\int_{\partial_i^\epsilon} u_1 \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial n} \rightarrow k_i,$$

for some $k_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Summing up, we have obtained that:

$$(43) \quad I_3(\epsilon) \rightarrow K_3 = k_1 + \sum_{i=2}^N \left(\int_{\partial_1} u_i \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n} + \int_{\partial'_1} u_1 \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial n} + k_i \right).$$

Combining (35) with (40), (42) and (43), we conclude that

$$(44) \quad F(\varphi) = \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} \left\{ |\nabla(\bar{u} - \bar{u}_0)|^2 + \bar{Q}_\varphi(\nabla \bar{v}) \right\} + K,$$

where $K = K_1 + K_2 + K_3$ is independent of $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^*$. Now the proof can proceed as in Lemma 11. Truncate $\bar{u} - \bar{u}_0$ above at

$$\bar{T}_1 = \sup_{\partial\Omega} \bar{u} + 1,$$

to get a map $\varphi' = (u', v') \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfying $F(\varphi') \leq F(\varphi)$, and

$$(45) \quad \varphi'(x) \in \mathcal{B}_{\gamma_1}(\bar{u}_0(x) + \bar{T}_1), \quad \forall x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma.$$

Let $c_7 = \sup_{\Omega_1} \sum_{i=2}^N u_i$, then from (45), we obtain:

$$(46) \quad \varphi'(x) \in \mathcal{B}_{\gamma_1}(-u_1(x) + c_7 + \bar{T}_1), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_1 \setminus \Sigma_1.$$

Now, truncate $u' - u_0$ above at

$$T_1 = \max\{\sup_{\partial\Omega} u + 1, \bar{T}_1, (2a)^{-1} \log 2\},$$

to get a map $\varphi'' = (u'', v') \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfying $F(\varphi'') \leq F(\varphi') \leq F(\varphi)$, and

$$(47) \quad \varphi''(x) \in \mathcal{B}_{-\gamma_1}(u_1(x) + T'_1), \quad \forall x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma,$$

where $T'_1 = T_1 + c_7$. As in the proof of Lemma 11, it follows from Lemma 5 and (46) that:

$$(48) \quad \varphi''(x) \in \mathcal{B}_{\gamma_1}(-u_1(x) + T'_1), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_1 \setminus \Sigma_1.$$

Therefore, combining (47) with (48), and Lemma 3, we conclude that:

$$(49) \quad \varphi''(x) \in B_{R_1}(\varphi_1(x)), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_1 \setminus \Sigma_1,$$

where $R_1 = T'_1 + a^{-1} \log 2$. Now consider the map $\varphi''|_{\Omega'}$, where $\Omega' = \cup_{i=2}^N \Omega_i$ and note that, since $\partial\Omega' = (\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega') \cup (\partial\Omega' \cap \Omega_1)$, (49) together with ψ give a pointwise a priori estimate for φ'' throughout $\partial\Omega'$. Thus one can proceed by induction to obtain a map $\varphi''' \in \mathcal{H}$ which satisfies $F(\varphi''') \leq F(\varphi)$, and for each $1 \leq i \leq N$:

$$\varphi'''(x) \in B_{R_i}(\varphi_i(x)), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_i \setminus \Sigma_i,$$

for some constants R_i depending only on the boundary map ψ , and the Σ_i -singular harmonic maps φ_i . Set $R = \max_i R_i$, then we have obtained $\varphi''' \in \mathcal{H}_R$ with $F(\varphi''') \leq F(\varphi)$. This completes the proof of Lemma 13, and of Proposition 2. $\square$

APPENDIX

In this appendix, we derive Equations (10)–(12) and (15) used in Lemma 6. Our starting point will be the disk models for the spaces $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\ell}$, as given in [12, Section 19], but first we briefly recall how these models are obtained. Consider $\mathbb{K}^{\ell+1}$ as a right $\mathbb{K}$ -module equipped with the bilinear form:

$$(50) \quad \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle = \bar{x}_0 y_0 - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \bar{x}_k y_k.$$

where $x \mapsto \bar{x}$ is the standard involution of $\mathbb{K}$. Let $\pi: \mathbb{K}^{\ell+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{PK}^{\ell}$ denote the natural map onto the projective space $\mathbb{PK}^{\ell}$ of $\mathbb{K}^{\ell+1}$. Consider $\overline{\mathbb{D}} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{K}^{\ell+1} : \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle > 0\}$, and its image $\mathbb{D} = \pi(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ under π . Introduce non-homogeneous coordinates $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{K}^{\ell}$ on $\mathbb{D}$ by

$$(51) \quad z_k = x_k x_0^{-1}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq \ell,$$

and define the bilinear form:

$$(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \bar{z}_k w_k.$$

It is easily seen that $\mathbb{D} = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{K}^{\ell} : (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}) < 1\}$. Now, the metric

$$(52) \quad d\bar{s}^2 = -\frac{\langle d\mathbf{x}, d\mathbf{x} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle} + \frac{|\langle d\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle|^2}{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2}$$

on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ is invariant under the right action of $\mathbb{K}$, hence it induces a quotient metric on $\mathbb{D}$, which in terms of the coordinates $\mathbf{z}$ turns out to be:

$$(53) \quad ds^2 = \frac{|d\mathbf{z}|^2}{1 - |\mathbf{z}|^2} + \frac{|\langle d\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z} \rangle|^2}{(1 - |\mathbf{z}|^2)^2}.$$

To see this, use (51) to get $dz_k = dx_k x_0^{-1} - x_k x_0^{-1} dx_0 x_0^{-1}$, and substitute into the left-hand side of (53) to obtain the left-hand side of (52). If we now let $GL(\ell, \mathbb{K})$ act on the left on $\mathbb{K}^{\ell+1}$, and we let $G \subset GL(\ell, \mathbb{K})$ be a subgroup which leaves the form (50) invariant, then clearly, G leaves $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ invariant. Also, the action of G commutes with the right action of $\mathbb{K}$ on $\mathbb{K}^{\ell+1}$, hence G acts on $\mathbb{PK}^{\ell}$ leaving $\mathbb{D}$ invariant. Thus, we obtain a left G -action on $\mathbb{D}$, which leaves the metric (53) invariant. Let $h = (h_{kj}) \in G$, then this action $(h, \mathbf{z}) \mapsto h \cdot \mathbf{z}$ is easily seen to be given by the Möbius transformation:

$$(54) \quad (h \cdot \mathbf{z})_k = \left(h_{k0} + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} h_{kj} z_j \right) \left(h_{00} + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} h_{0j} z_j \right)^{-1}.$$

Let $G = SO_0(1, \ell)$ when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, $G = SU(1, \ell)$ when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, and $G = Sp(1, \ell)$ when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{H}$. It is not difficult to see that G is transitive on $\mathbb{D}$. Let $\mathbf{x}_0 = (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and let $\mathbf{o} = \pi(\mathbf{x}_0)$, then the isotropy subgroup $H_{\mathbf{o}} \subset G$ of $\mathbf{o}$ is readily calculated. When $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, we have $H_{\mathbf{o}} = SO(\ell)$, while when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, we have $H_{\mathbf{o}} = S(U(1) \times$

$U(\ell)$), and when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{H}$, we have $H_{\mathbf{o}} = Sp(1) \times Sp(\ell)$. Thus, we conclude that $(\mathbb{D}, ds^2)$ can serve as a model for $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\ell}$. In order to calculate the distance function on $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\ell}$, first note that the real lines $\mathbf{z}t$ through $\mathbf{o}$ in $\mathbb{D}$ are geodesics, hence if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{D}$, then $\text{dist}(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{z}) = \tanh^{-1}(|\mathbf{z}|)$. Now use the action (54), to obtain for each $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{D}$ an element $h \in G$ such that $h \cdot \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{o}$. Since for this h , we have $1 - |h \cdot \mathbf{w}|^2 = |1 - (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})|^{-2} (1 - |\mathbf{z}|^2)(1 - |\mathbf{w}|^2)$ for all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{D}$, that leads to:

$$(55) \quad \text{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) = \cosh^{-1} \left(\frac{|1 - (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})|}{(1 - |\mathbf{z}|^2)^{1/2} (1 - |\mathbf{w}|^2)^{1/2}} \right).$$

We now wish to obtain an upper half-space model for $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\ell}$. For this purpose, we compute the Busemann function $f_{-\gamma}$ where γ is any geodesic. Since $H_{\mathbb{K}}^{\ell}$ is homogeneous and isotropic, we may assume that $\mathbb{D}$ has been so constructed that γ is the real line through $\mathbf{o}$ tangent to $\mathbf{e}_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, i.e. $\gamma(t) = \mathbf{e}_1 \tanh(t)$. It is now straightforward to check that:

$$(56) \quad f_{-\gamma}(\mathbf{z}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} [\text{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{e}_1 \tanh(-t)) - t] = \log \frac{|1 + z_1|}{(1 - |\mathbf{z}|^2)^{1/2}}.$$

We set $u = f_{-\gamma}$. Following [11], we define:

$$w_1 = (1 - z_1)(1 + z_1)^{-1}, \quad w_k = z_k(1 + z_1)^{-1}, \quad \text{for } 2 \leq k \leq \ell.$$

We find that:

$$\text{Re } w_1 - \sum_{k=2}^{\ell} |w_k|^2 = \frac{1 - |\mathbf{z}|^2}{|1 + z_1|^2} = e^{-2u},$$

hence:

$$(57) \quad d(e^{-2u}) = \text{Re}[dw_1 - 2 \sum_{k=2}^{\ell} \bar{w}_k dw_k].$$

Furthermore, we have:

$$(58) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} e^{4u} |dw_1 - 2 \sum_{k=2}^{\ell} \bar{w}_k dw_k|^2 &= \frac{|dz_1|^2}{|1 + z_1|^2} + \frac{|(\mathbf{z}, d\mathbf{z})|^2}{(1 - |\mathbf{z}|^2)^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{2 \text{Re}[(1 + \bar{z}_1)^{-1} d\bar{z}_1 (1 + z_1)(\mathbf{z}, d\mathbf{z})(1 + z_1)^{-1}]}{1 - |\mathbf{z}|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(59) \quad \begin{aligned} e^{2u} \sum_{k=2}^{\ell} |dw_k|^2 &= \frac{|d\mathbf{z}|^2 - |dz_1|^2}{1 - |\mathbf{z}|^2} + \frac{(|\mathbf{z}|^2 - |z_1|^2) |dz_1|^2}{|1 + z_1|^2 (1 - |\mathbf{z}|^2)} \\ &\quad - \frac{2 \text{Re}[(1 + \bar{z}_1)^{-1} d\bar{z}_1 (1 + z_1)((\mathbf{z}, d\mathbf{z}) - \bar{z}_1 dz_1)(1 + z_1)^{-1}]}{1 - |\mathbf{z}|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (58) and (59), we conclude that the metric (53) is given by:

$$(60) \quad ds^2 = \frac{1}{4}e^{4u}|dw_1 - 2\sum_{k=2}^{\ell}\bar{w}_k dw_k|^2 + e^{2u}\sum_{k=2}^{\ell}|dw_k|^2.$$

Let $d\theta$ denote the form $dw_1 - 2\sum_{k=2}^{\ell}\bar{w}_k dw_k$, then from Equation (60) and (57), we now see that:

$$ds^2 = du^2 + \frac{1}{4}e^{4u}|(d\theta - \overline{d\theta})/2|^2 + e^{2u}\sum_{k=2}^{\ell}|dw_k|^2.$$

We can now obtain the coordinate system $\phi = (u, v)$ as claimed in Lemma 6. If $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, we set $v_k = w_k$ for $2 \leq k \leq \ell$, and immediately obtain (10). If $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, we set

$$v_1 = \frac{1}{2}\text{Im } w_1, \quad v_{2k} = \text{Re } w_k, \quad v_{2k+1} = \text{Im } w_k, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq \ell - 1,$$

and obtain (11). Finally, if $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{H}$, let $\{1, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$ be the standard basis of $\mathbb{H}$ over $\mathbb{R}$. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{i}v_1 + \mathbf{j}v_2 + \mathbf{k}v_3 &= \frac{1}{4}(w_1 - \bar{w}_1) \\ v_{4k} + \mathbf{i}v_{4k+1} + \mathbf{j}v_{4k+2} + \mathbf{k}v_{4k+3} &= w_k, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq \ell - 1, \end{aligned}$$

and obtain (12).

In order to derive (15), we observe that:

$$f_\gamma(\mathbf{z}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} [\text{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{e}_1 \tanh(t)) - t] = \log \frac{|1 - z_1|}{(1 - |\mathbf{z}|^2)^{1/2}},$$

and

$$|w_1|^{-2} \left(\text{Re } w_1 - \sum_{k=2}^{\ell} |w_k|^2 \right) = \text{Re } w^{-1} - |w_1|^{-2} \sum_{k=2}^{\ell} |w_k|^2 = e^{-2f_\gamma}.$$

Thus, setting $\bar{u} = f_\gamma$, we have $e^{2\bar{u}} = e^{2u} |w_1|^2$. Since

$$|w_1|^2 = \left(e^{-2u} + \sum_{k=2}^{\ell} |w_k|^2 \right)^2 + \frac{1}{4} |w_1 - \bar{w}_1|^2,$$

we immediately obtain (15).

REFERENCES

- [1] R. BACH AND H. WEYL, *Neue Lösungen der Einsteinschen Gravitationsgleichungen*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **13** (1921), 132–145.
- [2] M. T. ANDERSON, *Complete Minimal Hypersurfaces in Hyperbolic n -Manifolds*, Comment. Math. Helvetici **58** (1983), 264–290.
- [3] P. EBERLEIN AND B. O’NEILL, *Visibility Manifolds*, Pacific J. Math **46** (1973), 45–109.
- [4] R. HAMILTON, *Harmonic Maps of Manifolds with Boundary*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics No. 471, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1975.

- [5] E. HEINTZE AND H. C. IM HOF, *Geometry of Horospheres*, J. Diff. Geom. **12** (1977), 481–491.
- [6] S. HELGASON, *Differential Geometry, Lie Groups, and Symmetric Spaces*, Pure and Applied Mathematics No. 80, Academic Press, Boston, 1978.
- [7] P. LI AND L.-F. TAM, *The Heat Equation and Harmonic Maps of Complete Manifolds*, Invent. Math. **105** (1991), 159–192.
- [8] ———, *Uniqueness and Regularity of Proper Harmonic Maps*, Ann. Math. **137** (1993), 167–201.
- [9] Y. LI AND G. TIAN, *Regularity of Harmonic Maps with Prescribed Asymptotic Behavior and Applications*, Comm. Math. Phys. **149** (1992), No. 1, 1–30.
- [10] ———, *Harmonic Maps with Prescribed Singularities*, Differential Geometry; Partial Differential Equations on Manifolds (Los Angeles, CA 1990), 317–326, Symp. Pure Math., **54**, Part 1, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1993.
- [11] P. O. MAZUR, *Proof of Uniqueness of the Kerr-Newman Black Holes*, J. Phys. A **15** (1982), 3173–3180.
- [12] G. D. MOSTOW, *Strong Rigidity of Locally Symmetric Spaces*, Annals of Mathematics Studies No. 78, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1973.
- [13] R. SCHOEN AND K. UHLENBECK, *A Regularity Theory for Harmonic Maps*, J. Diff. Geom. **17** (1982), 307–335.
- [14] ———, *Boundary Regularity and the Dirichlet Problem for Harmonic Maps*, J. Diff. Geom. **18** (1983), 253–268.
- [15] R. SCHOEN AND S. T. YAU, *Compact Group Actions and the Topology of Manifolds with Non-Positive Curvature*, Top. **18** (1979), 361–380.
- [16] Y. SHEN, *A Liouville Theorem for Harmonic Maps*, Amer. J. Math. to appear.
- [17] L. SIMON, *Lectures on Geometric Measure Theory*, Proceedings of the Center for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University, Canberra, 1983.
- [18] G. WEINSTEIN, *On Rotating Black Holes in Equilibrium in General Relativity*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **43** (1990), 903–948.
- [19] ———, *The Stationary Axisymmetric Two-Body Problem in General Relativity*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **45** (1992), 1183–1203.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM, BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA 35294
E-mail address: weinstei@math.uab.edu